

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending in the application. While no claims are amended hereby, the Applicants provide a listing of the claims for the convenience of the Examiner. Claims 1-3, 7, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,215,982 to Trompower ("Trompower") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,133,666 to Arai ("Arai"). Claims 4-6, 8, and 10-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Trompower in view of Arai and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,470,184 to Machida ("Machida"). Claims 1, 4, and 11 are independent. Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

Claims 1-3, 7, and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Trompower in view of Arai. Claims 4-6, 8, and 10-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Trompower in view of Arai and further in view of Machida. Trompower and Arai form the basis for the rejection of independent claims 1, 4, and 11.¹ Independent claims 1, 4, and 11 each recite: "[A] wireless LAN base station device" that includes "plural antennas for making communication with a wireless terminal," "plural transmission-reception portions connected to said plural antennas," and "plural control processors for controlling said plural transmission reception portions." The combination of Trompower and Arai does not disclose these limitations.

¹ Independent claims 1 and 4 also recite: "a central processor for controlling said plural control processors." Applicant notes that independent claim 11 does not include this limitation in the recitation of the claim. Applicant points this out because the Office Action at page 4, paragraph 3 notes that claim 11, *inter alia*, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trompower in view of Arai in further view of Machida, stating "claims 4-6, 11 Trompower and Arai teach all limitations as explained above in claim 1, except transceiver pauses time zone in which the communication load is low." Because Arai is cited for a limitation which is not contained in claim 11, the basis for the rejection of claim 11 is unclear.

The Office Action alleges that Trompower shows “plural control transmission-reception portions,” citing to base station 115 with “plurality of transceivers and processor (202) of Figs. 2, 5, 7-8).” See Office Action, page 2. Applicants agree that Trompower shows plural transmission-reception portions. But Applicants want to point out that they are not claiming “plural control transmission-reception portions” as indicated at page 2 of the Office Action. The independent claims recite: “**plural control processors** for controlling said plural transmission-reception portions.” Trompower does not disclose **plural control processors** controlling said plural transmission-reception portions, as recited in the independent claims.

The Office Action admits that Trompower does not “teach central processor that controls plurality of processor.” Office Action, page 3. The Office Action states that “Arai teaches central processor (107) that controls plurality of processors (102 and 103 of Figure 2) which controls reception and transmission (transceiver 101)(see Figures 2 through 4).” *Id.* Applicants respectfully disagree that the units (102) and (103) correspond to the claimed control processors. As described above, the claimed control processor controls a plurality of transmission-reception portions. As described at column 3, lines 17-28, elements 102 and 103 are not control processors at all, they perform modulation and demodulation of the time division multiplexed signals of the system of Arai. Therefore, elements 102 and 103 in Arai correspond to the modulation elements 250, 251 and 253 in the code division multiplexing system of Trompower. Accordingly, elements 102 and 103 do not read on the claimed control processors.

Arai does not add anything to Trompower, and even if Arai were combined, the combination would merely add TDMA capabilities to the CDMA system of Trompower.

The combination would still not read on the plurality of control processors as recited in independent claims 1, 4 and 11.

For the reasons given above, the combination of Trompower and Arai does not teach each and every limitation of independent claims 1, 4, and 11. All the dependent claims depend from these independent claims. Machida does not cure the deficiency of Trompower and Arai as applied to the independent claims, Applicants urge reconsideration and withdrawal of all the rejections.

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

No fee is believed to be due for this Amendment. Should any fees be required, please charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-2215.

Dated: June 11, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By /Brian M. McGuire/

Brian M. McGuire

Registration No.: 55,445

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas

41st Floor

New York, New York 10036-2714

(212) 277-6500

Attorney for Applicants